

On the Marginal Value of Electricity Storage*

Eilyan Bitar^a, Pramod Khargonekar^b, and Kameshwar Poolla^c

Abstract—We investigate the problem of characterizing the marginal value of energy storage capacity to a wind power producer (WPP) participating in a conventional two-settlement electricity market. The WPP can offer a forward contract to supply power in the day-ahead market, subject to financial penalty for imbalances arising between the contracted and realized supply in real-time. We consider the setting in which the WPP has access to dedicated energy storage, and can thus reshape its realized supply, subject to its storage capacity constraints. Treating wind as a random process, we show that the problem of determining optimal forward contract offerings, given recourse with storage, reduces to convex programming. We further establish that the maximum expected profit is concave and non-decreasing in the energy storage capacity, which reveals that greatest marginal benefit from energy storage is derived from initial investment in capacity. Going beyond numerical sensitivities, which often prove cumbersome to compute and limited in terms of their explanatory power, we derive explicit formulae that uncover a fundamental connection between the value of storage capacity and certain spectral properties of the random wind power process. These simple expressions not only shed light on the correct measure of statistical variation in quantifying the value of storage, but also provide a tractable approach to marginal value calculations from data, as our results require no distributional assumptions on the wind power process.

I. INTRODUCTION

Driven by concerns of climate change and energy security, there is an accelerating worldwide investment in renewable energy [19]. The available supply of power from sources like wind and solar is *variable* – it is uncertain, intermittent, and largely uncontrollable. These characteristics pose major challenges to the deep integration of renewables into the grid [16], [17], [18].

There is a considerable investment and interest in energy storage as a means to mitigate the variability of renewable generation [7], [8], [10], [13], [14], [20], [21], [22], [25], [15], [33], [34]. For instance, California’s strategic storage mandate calls for 1.3 GW of ramping capability to be commissioned by 2020. Hydro-power has traditionally been used for such purposes [9]. While pumped hydro is an efficient and flexible

storage modality, its siting is geographically constrained and thus offers limited balancing capability to the system at large due to transmission constraints. As utility-scale renewable energy resources continue to proliferate, the ability to directly shape their power output with alternative forms of electric energy storage becomes more compelling.

In this paper, we investigate the ability of energy storage to mitigate the cost of balancing variable power supplied from renewable energy resources. The perspective taken is that of a wind power producer (WPP), whose objective is to sell its *variable power* in a conventional, two-settlement energy market [1], [3], [4], [12], [27], [28], [30], [32]. In such markets, imbalances arising between the contracted and realized supply of power are subject to financial penalty. Accordingly, we quantify the value of *co-located energy storage* in terms of its ability to reduce the expected cost of such contract imbalances, and thereby increase the quantity of wind power that is sold.

A. Main Contributions and Related Work

Energy storage devices such as pumped-hydro, compressed air [22], [26], sodium-sulfur batteries [29], and more general battery-based technologies [13] offer the capability to firm variable wind power. The ability to do so depends centrally on the placement, sizing, and control of such energy storage systems. There are a number of papers that explore the economic viability of these hybrid wind-storage systems in producing baseload generation [6], [7], [20]. These studies conclude that such hybrid systems compete favorably with gas turbine, conventional fossil fuel, and nuclear generation. Optimal siting of storage in transmission constrained power systems is explored in [11]. A summary of recent system level wind integration studies may be found in [8].

This paper considers the problem of leveraging energy storage to improve the profitability of a wind power producer (WPP) participating in a two-settlement energy market. The WPP offers a contract for firm power in the day-ahead market, subject to financial penalty for deviations between the contracted and realized supply. The recourse afforded by storage serves to reduce the risk exposure of the WPP, enabling it to offer larger contracts, which in turn increases its expected profit. We show that optimal contract sizing problem reduces to convex programming. We also prove that the maximum expected profit of the WPP is a concave and non-decreasing function of the storage capacity. As a result, the maximal marginal benefit is derived for a *small* storage capacity. We explicitly characterize this marginal benefit in terms of a specific measure of statistical variation in the underlying wind power process. Our structural and marginal value results are *distribution-free*, in the sense that they hold for arbitrary distributions on the underlying wind power process. In addition, our

*This work was supported in part by NSF grant ECCS-1351621, NSF grant CNS-1239178, NSF grant CNS-1239274, PSERC sub-award S-52, and the US DoE under the CERTS initiative. This work builds on our preliminary results, presented at the 30th IEEE American Control Conference [5]. The current manuscript differs significantly from the conference version in terms of new results, formal proofs, and detailed technical discussions.

^aCorresponding author: E. Bitar is with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853 USA. (eyb5@cornell.edu)

^bP. Khargonekar is with the University of California, Irvine, CA 92697 USA.

^cK. Poola is with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94704 USA.

storage model accommodates intra-contract sub-hourly storage adjustments. This enables us to capture the effects of intra-hour wind power variability on the value of storage.

Research most closely related to the work in this paper include [1], [23]. Optimizing combined wind/hydro power in a day-ahead energy market is explored in [1]. The authors formulate a stochastic optimization problem that accounts for uncertainty in the wind power and electricity prices. Using a *scenario based* approach, they show that the optimization problem can be cast as a mixed integer linear program. The authors in [23] treat the problem of jointly optimizing hour-ahead wind energy commitments with dedicated storage to maximize expected profit over an infinite horizon. Under a myopic storage control policy, the authors use dynamic programming to characterize optimal contracts and determine the increase in steady state profit attributable to storage.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Sections II and III describe the models we employ in our analysis, and formulate the specific problems we address, respectively. Our main results are presented in Sections IV and V, followed by concluding remarks in Section VI.

Notation: For any finite set A , we denote its cardinality by $|A|$. Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of non-negative integers, $\mathbb{R}$ the set of real numbers, $\mathbb{R}_+$ the non-negative reals, and $\mathbb{R}^N$ the usual Euclidean space. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $x^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$ and $x^- = \min\{x, 0\}$. For any subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$, we define the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_A : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as

$$\mathbf{1}_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in A \\ 0, & x \notin A. \end{cases}$$

II. SUPPLY, STORAGE AND MARKET MODELS

A. Intermittent Supply Model

Time is slotted and indexed by k . The intermittent generation of the WPP in slot k is ξ_k . This is normalized to nameplate so $\xi_k \in [0, 1]$. We model the wind farm output as a discrete-time random process $\xi = (\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$. Let

$$\Phi_k(x) = \mathbb{P}\{\xi_k \leq x\}, \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1. \quad (1)$$

denote the cumulative distribution function of ξ_k . Define the *time-averaged* cumulative distribution function as

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \Phi_k(x). \quad (2)$$

We assume the intermittent supply has a *zero cost of production*, as it is derived from wind and solar energy.

B. Energy Storage Model

We consider a simple energy balance model [25] for *perfectly efficient* energy storage¹:

$$z_{k+1} = z_k - u_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (3)$$

¹The assumption of perfectly efficient storage is for ease of exposition. All of our results can be generalized to accommodate non-ideal storage systems with leakage and energy conversion inefficiencies. See Remark 1 for a discussion on such generalization.

Here $z_k \geq 0$ is the amount of energy in the storage at the beginning of time slot k , and u_k is the energy *extracted* from storage during slot k . If $u_k < 0$ energy is injected into the storage. Without loss of generality, we assume zero initial condition, $z_0 = 0$. We impose the state and input constraints:

$$0 \leq z_k \leq b \quad (4)$$

$$-r \leq u_k \leq r \quad (5)$$

to capture the *energy capacity* b and the maximum charging/discharging *rate* r . We refer to the *storage type* as the parameter vector $\theta = (b, r)$.

C. Market Models

We consider a two-settlement market structure consisting of a day-ahead (DA) forward market and a real-time (RT) imbalance market. Uninstructed deviations from forward energy commitments are penalized *ex post*.²

Forward Market. In the DA forward market, a generator offers a sequence of contracts for energy that are typically constant power on intervals of length one hour. In the following formulation, we restrict our analysis to a single contract interval, which we discretize into N time slots. We let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (MWh) denote the offered contract, which is taken to be constant across the N time slots. The supplier is paid according to the forward market price $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (\$/MWh), which yields the supplier a revenue of $N \cdot px$ for an offered contract x .

The supplier is assumed to behave as a *price taker* in the forward market. As such, the forward settlement price p is assumed fixed and known. This assumption is natural under the presupposition that the supplier's individual capacity is small relative to aggregate capacity of the market.

Imbalance Market. As the forward contract x is commonly offered with significant lead time on delivery, deviations naturally arise between the offered contract and the realized supply. These contract deviations are penalized according to imbalance prices derived from the spot market. A shortfall in generation during period k is penalized at a price $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (\$/MWh), while an excess in generation is penalized at price $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (\$/MWh). Typically, deviations from hour-long forward contracts are measured on a finer temporal granularity corresponding to intervals of length five minutes. As such, we consider a temporal discretization of the contract interval into N periods, where each period's imbalance is measured relative to a baseline energy, x , which is uniform across periods and thus equivalent to a constant power contract.

We treat the imbalances prices (α, β) as *random* and *unknown* at the time of the forward contract offering – not being revealed until the initial delivery period ($k = 0$). Their expected values at the time of forward contract offering are denoted by

$$m_\alpha = \mathbb{E}[\alpha] \quad \text{and} \quad m_\beta = \mathbb{E}[\beta].$$

²The market model we consider conforms with the prevailing literature related to the integration of wind through two-settlement market constructs. For example, see [2], [3], [4], [5], [12], [27], [32].

The imbalance prices (α, β) are assumed to be independent of the intermittent supply process ξ . Again, this is natural in the event that the supplier's capacity is small relative to the market size, as the supplier's realized production will have negligible effect on the market clearing price. We make the following technical assumption.

Assumption 1. We assume that $m_\alpha \geq p$ to avoid degenerate optimal contract offerings.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Working within this idealized setting, we now formalize the question of how a generator with intermittent supply might optimize a forward contract offering for energy given a subsequent sequence of recourse opportunities to reshape the realized supply profile using a constrained energy storage device. Building on intermediary results characterizing the structure of the optimal value function, the eventual goal is a parametric sensitivity analysis yielding an explicit characterization of the *marginal value of energy storage capacity*. We begin by characterizing the space of admissible, causal storage control policies.

Admissible Control Policies: An admissible storage control policy $\pi = (\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{N-1})$ is any finite sequence of decision functions that causally map from the available information to actions, and respect constraints on both the input to and state of storage. We define the *system state* at period k as the pair $(z_k, \xi_k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$, where we recall that z_k represents the energy storage state just preceding period k , while ξ_k denotes the intermittent supply realized during period k . We assume *perfect state feedback* and consider control policies with *full information history*. Namely, the information available to any controller at time k is the vector $I_k := (x, z_{\leq k}, \xi_{\leq k})$, where $z_{\leq k} = (z_0, \dots, z_k)$ and $\xi_{\leq k} = (\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k)$. Naturally, we allow the control policy to depend explicitly on the forward contract x . A control policy π thus defines the map

$$u_k = \mu_k(I_k) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1,$$

where $u_k \in \mathbb{R}$ is the *input* to the storage system at time k .

We now characterize the space of admissible control policies, as determined by the storage type $\theta = (b, r)$. We define the *feasible state space* $\mathcal{Z}(b)$ as the set of all energy storage states respecting the energy capacity constraint. Namely, $\mathcal{Z}(b) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid 0 \leq z \leq b\}$. Given an energy storage state $z \in \mathcal{Z}(b)$, we define the corresponding *feasible input space* as the set of all inputs belonging to

$$\mathcal{U}(z; \theta) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} \mid z - u \in \mathcal{Z}(b), \quad |u| \leq r\},$$

which guarantees one-step state feasibility and input rate constraint satisfaction.

Definition III.1 (Admissible policies). A control policy $\pi = (\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{N-1})$ is deemed admissible if

$$\mu_k(I_k) \in \mathcal{U}(z_k; \theta)$$

almost surely for all I_k and $k = 0, \dots, N-1$. We denote by $\Pi(\theta)$ the space of all admissible control policies with full information history.

Criterion: We define the *expected profit* $J^\pi(x; \theta)$ derived by a supplier, with a storage of type θ , as the revenue derived from a forward contract offering x less the expected imbalance cost incurred under an admissible storage control policy $\pi \in \Pi(\theta)$. More precisely, we define the expected profit as

$$J^\pi(x; \theta) = N \cdot px - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g(x, u_k^\pi, \xi_k) \right], \quad (6)$$

where expectation is taken with respect to (α, β, ξ) and $g(x, u_k^\pi, \xi_k)$ denotes the imbalance cost realized at each time period k . More precisely, we have

$$g(x, u, \xi) = \alpha(x - \xi - u)^+ + \beta(\xi + u - x)^+. \quad (7)$$

Notice that the stage cost g is indeed a convex function of its arguments. For notational concision, we suppress the dependency of g on the imbalance prices (α, β) . In addition, we will occasionally write the storage state and control processes as $\{z_k^\pi\}$ and $\{u_k^\pi\}$ to emphasize their dependence on the storage control policy π .

We wish to characterize forward contract offerings x and control policies π that together yield a maximum expected profit. This amounts to the solution of a *two-stage stochastic program*, where the recourse problem constitutes a constrained stochastic control problem. Problem optimality is defined as follows.

Definition III.2 (Optimality). An admissible pair $(\pi^*, x^*) \in \Pi(\theta) \times \mathbb{R}$ is deemed optimal if

$$J^{\pi^*}(x^*; \theta) \geq J^\pi(x; \theta) \quad \text{for all } (\pi, x) \in \Pi(\theta) \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We will occasionally write the optimal value function and an optimal solution pair as $J^*(\theta)$ and $(\pi^*(\theta), x^*(\theta))$, respectively, to emphasize their parametric dependency on the storage type parameter θ .

The optimal forward contract may be non-unique. In order to avoid technical issues associated with such non-uniqueness, we will restrict our attention to smallest contract among all optimal contracts for each θ . Specifically, define the minimal optimal contract as $x^*(\theta) = \inf \mathcal{X}^*(\theta)$, where $\mathcal{X}^*(\theta) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid J^{\pi^*(\theta)}(x; \theta) \geq J^{\pi^*(\theta)}(y; \theta) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}\}$ denotes the set of all optimal contracts associated with a storage type θ .

IV. OPTIMAL CONTRACT PROPERTIES

We now characterize the optimal storage control policy and establish concavity of the expected profit criterion in the forward contract x .

A. Optimal Contract Sizing for $b = 0$

Consider first the special case of optimal contract sizing in the absence of storage, i.e. $b = 0$. Naturally, in the absence of storage capacity, the set of admissible storage control policies is identically zero. And the problem of selecting a forward contract to maximize the expected profit reduces to a so-called *newsvendor problem* [31]. The convexity of this optimization problem is guaranteed under our postulated assumptions. We have the following result established in [4], [12].

Lemma IV.1. Consider a storage type $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ with $b = 0$. The corresponding optimal contract is given by the quantile

$$x^*(\theta) = F^{-1}(\gamma) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid F(x) \geq \gamma\},$$

where $\gamma := (p + m_\beta)/(m_\alpha + m_\beta) \in [0, 1]$.

The quantile structure of the optimal contract will prove essential to characterizing the marginal value of storage at the origin, which we present in Theorem V.5.

B. Optimal Contract Sizing for $b > 0$

In the presence of positive storage capacity, $b > 0$, the selection of an optimal forward contract will naturally depend on the storage type implicitly through the choice of optimal control policy $\pi^* \in \Pi(\theta)$. We now characterize the optimal control policy in Proposition IV.2.

Proposition IV.2 (Optimal control policy). *Given a storage type $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, the optimal control policy $\pi^* = (\mu^*, \dots, \mu^*) \in \Pi(\theta)$ is (i) myopic and (ii) of a threshold-type satisfying*

$$\mu^*(x, z, \xi) = \begin{cases} \min\{x - \xi, z, r\}, & \xi \leq x \\ -\min\{\xi - x, b - z, r\}, & \xi > x \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

for all $(x, z, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{Z}(b) \times \Xi$.

We omit the proof of Proposition IV.2, as optimality of the control policy (8) can be shown by direct inspection of the corresponding dynamic programming equations.

While we do not offer an explicit expression for the optimal contract size in this more general setting, we establish in Theorem IV.3 concavity of the expected profit criterion $J^{\pi^*}(x; \theta)$ in the contract size x , under the optimal control policy π^* specified in (8). See Appendix A for a proof of Theorem IV.3.

Theorem IV.3 (Convexity of optimal contract sizing). *Let $\pi^* \in \Pi(\theta)$ denote the optimal control policy associated with a storage of type θ and a particular forward contract $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, the expected profit $J^{\pi^*}(x; \theta)$ is a concave function in x over $\mathbb{R}_+$.*

It follows from Theorem IV.3 that an optimal contract can be computed by solving a finite-dimensional, unconstrained convex optimization problem given by $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{J^{\pi^*}(x; \theta)\}$.

V. THE MARGINAL VALUE OF STORAGE

Energy capacity constitutes a large percentage of the capital cost associated with many storage modalities. Hence, in order to accurately amortize the the capital investment in storage capacity over a period of time, it is of vital importance to quantify the fiscal benefit of energy storage capacity to the supplier. Such a relation can then be used to optimally size the storage system so as to maximize return on investment. In Theorem IV.3, we proved that the problem of computing optimal contract offerings and the corresponding expected profit reduces to convex programming. In the following Theorem V.1, we show that the optimal expected profit $J^*(\theta)$ is concave and non-decreasing in the storage type $\theta = (b, r)$. See Appendix B for its proof.

Theorem V.1. *The maximum expected profit $J^*(\theta)$ is concave and monotonically non-decreasing in the energy storage type parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.*

The consequences of the Theorem V.1 are twofold. First, consider the problem of optimal storage sizing $\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \{J^*(\theta) - C(\theta)\}$, where $C(\theta)$ denotes the capital cost of energy storage capacity. If we assume a convex capital cost function³, then Theorem V.1 reveals that the problem of optimal storage sizing reduces to a finite-dimensional, convex optimization problem. Second, the concavity and monotonicity of the maximum expected profit function $J^*(\theta)$ in the storage type θ shows that the greatest marginal benefit is derived from a small amount of storage capacity. In Theorem V.5, we indeed provide a closed form expression for the marginal value of energy capacity $\partial J^*(\theta)/\partial b$ at the origin (i.e., for b small).

A. γ -Quantile Level Crossings

In Theorem V.5, we make precise the intuition that a larger variation in the intermittent supply process will manifest in a larger value of storage. In particular, we establish an explicit relationship between the marginal value of storage capacity at the origin and a specific measure of variation of the underlying intermittent supply process. Before stating our main result, we first establish a preliminary result in Lemma V.4, which quantifies the expected number of times a stochastic process exceeds a fixed level over a fixed interval of time. We have the following definition.




Fig. 1. A graphical illustration of the times at which a process $\xi = \{\xi_k\}$ exhibits strict upcrossings (o) and strict downcrossings (x) of a fixed level x . For this example, we have that $\Lambda_N(x, \xi) = 3$.

Definition V.2 (Strict level crossing). *A scalar sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{N-1})$ is said to have a strict downcrossing of the level $x \in \mathbb{R}$ at time k if $a_k > x$ and $a_{k+1} < x$. Thus, a strict downcrossing of x at time k corresponds to the event $x \in \mathcal{D}_k(\mathbf{a})$, where we define $\mathcal{D}_k(\mathbf{a}) = \{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid a_k > y > a_{k+1}\}$. Analogously, the sequence $\mathbf{a}$ is said to have a strict upcrossing of the level x at time k if $x \in \mathcal{U}_k(\mathbf{a})$, where we define $\mathcal{U}_k(\mathbf{a}) = \{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid a_k < y < a_{k+1}\}$.*

See Figure 1 for a graphical illustration of Definition V.2. We make the following technical assumption in order to restrict our attention to strict level crossings.

³This is a standard assumption in the literature. In fact, it is common to assume, more strongly, that the capital cost of energy storage capacity is linear [7], [9].

Assumption 2. *The joint distribution of the intermittent supply process ξ is assumed to be absolutely continuous.*

Under Assumption 2, sample paths of the process ξ are, with probability one, not identically equal to $x \in \mathbb{R}$ for any k . More precisely, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\bigcup_k \{\xi_k = x\}) \leq \sum_k \mathbb{P}\{\xi_k = x\} = 0$. Henceforth, we shall refer to all strict crossings as crossings, unless otherwise unclear from the context.

Definition V.3 (Number of Strict Downcrossings). *We denote the number of strict downcrossings of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ incurred by a scalar sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{N-1})$ on the interval $\{0, \dots, N-1\}$ by*

$$\Lambda_N(x, \mathbf{a}) := \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_k(\mathbf{a})}(x). \quad (9)$$

We will omit the subscript N when it is clear from the context.

We have the following Lemma characterizing the number of times the intermittent supply process is expected to strictly exceed, or fall below the quantile $F^{-1}(\gamma)$. First, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^+(x, \xi) &:= \{0 \leq k \leq N-1 \mid \xi_k > x\}, \\ \mathcal{K}^-(x, \xi) &:= \{0 \leq k \leq N-1 \mid \xi_k < x\} \end{aligned}$$

as the number of times which the supply *strictly exceeds*, and *strictly falls below* the level $x \in \mathbb{R}$, respectively.

Lemma V.4. *Let $\theta = 0$ and denote by $x^* \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the corresponding optimal contract. The following properties hold:*

- (i) $\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{K}^-(x^*, \xi)| = N\gamma$
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{K}^+(x^*, \xi)| = N(1 - \gamma)$
- (iii) $|\mathcal{K}^-(x^*, \xi)| + |\mathcal{K}^+(x^*, \xi)| = N$, almost surely,

where $\gamma := (p + m_\beta)/(m_\alpha + m_\beta)$.

Lemma V.4 reveals an interesting interpretation of the price ratio $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. Namely, in the absence of energy storage capacity (i.e., $\theta = 0$), the quantile structure of the optimal contract $x^* = F^{-1}(\gamma)$ is such that the fraction of times at which the intermittent supply is expected to fall short of the contract is precisely equal to γ .

Proof of Lemma V.4. We first prove part (iii). One can write the sum as

$$|\mathcal{K}^-(x^*, \xi)| + |\mathcal{K}^+(x^*, \xi)| = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x^*)}(\xi_k) + \mathbf{1}_{(x^*, \infty)}(\xi_k).$$

The result follows, as Assumption 2 implies that $\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x^*)}(\xi_k) + \mathbf{1}_{(x^*, \infty)}(\xi_k) = 1$ almost surely for all k . We now establish part (i) through the following string of inequalities.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{K}^-(x^*, \xi)| &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x^*)}(\xi_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}\{\xi_k < x^*\} \stackrel{(a)}{=} N \cdot F(x^*) \stackrel{(b)}{=} N\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the definition of the time averaged distribution F , and (b) follows from the fact that $x^* = F^{-1}(\gamma)$ (cf. Lemma IV.1). Part (ii) is an immediate consequence of parts (i) and (iii), thus completing the proof. $\square$

B. Level Crossings and the Marginal Value of Storage

We now characterize the marginal value of energy storage capacity at the origin. Essentially, Theorem V.5 reveals that the marginal value of initial investment in energy storage capacity depends on the statistical variation of supply, as measured through its expected number of strict contract downcrossings. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem V.5 is the first explicit characterization of the value of storage under general distributional assumptions on the intermittent supply process – requiring only that said process have an absolutely continuous joint distribution. The marginal value characterization (10) holds for general non-stationary processes. This is a point of practical importance, as the behavior of wind and solar power processes have been observed to be far from normal or stationary. Further, it is straightforward to empirically estimate the marginal value expression (10) from measured time series data using an empirical estimator.

Theorem V.5 (Marginal Value at the Origin). *Let $r > 0$. The marginal value of energy storage capacity at the origin ($b = 0$) exists and is given by*

$$\left. \frac{\partial J^*(\theta)}{\partial b} \right|_{b=0} = (m_\alpha + m_\beta) \mathbb{E}[\Lambda(x^*, \xi)] + m_\beta \mathbb{P}\{\xi_{N-1} > x^*\}, \quad (10)$$

where $x^* = F^{-1}(\gamma)$ and $\gamma := (p + m_\beta)/(m_\alpha + m_\beta)$.

Theorem V.5 has an appealing interpretation. The marginal value of energy storage capacity at the origin is proportional to the expected number of *energy arbitrage opportunities* – or, equivalently, the expected number of contract downcrossings. As an illustrative example, consider a system with a small amount of energy capacity, $b = \varepsilon > 0$, and power capacity, $r > \varepsilon$. Each time the intermittent supply process crosses the contract from above, one has the opportunity to inject an ε amount of energy into the storage system to decrement the surplus penalty by $\beta \cdot \varepsilon$. This contract downcrossing event is also accompanied by the additional opportunity to extract ε energy from the storage device and thus decrement the shortfall penalty by $\alpha \cdot \varepsilon$. Clearly then, the total realized benefit for small storage capacity is roughly equal to $(\alpha + \beta) \cdot \varepsilon$ multiplied by the number of energy arbitrage opportunities. The exact derivation of the marginal value of storage at the origin is more complex, however, as one has to additionally account for the sensitivity of the optimal contract to the storage size. See Appendix C for a proof of Theorem V.5.

Remark 1 (Marginal Value of Non-Ideal Storage). *Theorem V.5 can be extended to accommodate inefficiencies in storage. Consider the following generalization of our original storage model:*

$$z_{k+1} = \lambda z_k - \frac{1}{\eta_{\text{out}}}(u_k)^+ - \eta_{\text{in}}(u_k)^- \quad (11)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, N-1$. Here the scalar $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ represents a leakage coefficient; and the scalars $\eta_{\text{out}} \in (0, 1]$ and $\eta_{\text{in}} \in (0, 1]$ represent the conversion efficiency of energy extraction and injection, respectively. We recover our original storage model under a choice of parameters $\lambda = \eta_{\text{in}} = \eta_{\text{out}} = 1$. Working in this more general setting, one can easily establish a generalization of the marginal value result in Theorem V.5 as

$$\left. \frac{\partial J^*(\theta)}{\partial b} \right|_{b=0} = (\rho m_\alpha + m_\beta) \mathbb{E}[\Lambda(x^*, \xi)] + m_\beta \mathbb{P}\{\xi_{N-1} > x^*\},$$

where $x^* = F^{-1}(\gamma)$ and $\rho := \lambda \eta_{\text{in}} \eta_{\text{out}}$. Essentially, the inefficiencies in storage manifest themselves as a discount factor $\rho \in (0, 1]$ on the expected shortfall imbalance price m_α .

We have the following Corollary of Theorem V.5, which is somewhat surprising. In the event that the intermittent supply is described by an iid random process, the marginal value expression (10) reveals itself to be invariant under the choice of distribution, and dependent only on the expected imbalance prices.

Corollary V.6. *Let ξ be an iid process. Then the marginal value of energy storage capacity at the origin ($b = 0$) satisfies*

$$\left. \frac{\partial J^*(\theta)}{\partial b} \right|_{b=0} = (N-1)(m_\alpha + m_\beta)(1-\gamma)\gamma + m_\beta(1-\gamma),$$

where $\gamma := (p + m_\beta)/(m_\alpha + m_\beta)$.

We establish as an intermediary result in the proof of Corollary V.6 that the expected number of downcrossings satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda(x^*(0), \xi)] = (N-1) \cdot (1-\gamma)\gamma$, under the assumption of an iid intermittent supply process. This structural dependency on the price ratio $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ admits a simple probabilistic interpretation of the interplay between supply volatility and the value of storage. Namely, the expected number of strict downcrossings of the optimal contract is precisely equal to the variance of the sum of $N-1$ iid Bernoulli trials with success probability equal to the price ratio γ .

Proof of Corollary V.6. Using the assumption of independence across time, the expected number of strict $x^*(0)$ -level downcrossings can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda(x^*(0), \xi)] &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_k(\xi)}(x^*(0))] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} \mathbb{P}\{\xi_k > x^*(0), \xi_{k+1} < x^*(0)\} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (1 - \Phi_k(x^*(0))) \cdot \Phi_{k+1}(x^*(0)). \end{aligned}$$

And, as the marginal distributions are time invariant, we necessarily have equivalence between the time averaged distribution and each marginal distribution, which yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\Lambda(x^*(0), \xi)] = \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (1-\gamma)\gamma = (N-1) \cdot (1-\gamma)\gamma.$$

It similarly follows that $\mathbb{P}\{\xi_{N-1} > x^*(0)\} = 1 - \gamma$. Direct substitution of the previous two identities into Equation (10) yields the desired result. $\square$

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have formulated and solved the problem of optimal contract sizing for a wind power producer (WPP) participating in a conventional two-settlement electricity market, with *co-located energy storage*. Specifically, we have shown that the problem of determining optimal contract offerings for a WPP with co-located energy storage reduces to a finite-dimensional convex optimization problem. Our results have the merit of providing key analytical insight into the trade-offs between a variety of factors such as energy storage capacity and maximum expected profit. In particular, we show the marginal value of storage capacity to be largest for initial investments, and provide an analytical characterization of said marginal value – which reveals an explicit dependency of the margin value of storage on a certain measure of statistical variation in the underlying wind power process.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. L. Angarita, J. Usaolab, J. Martinez-Crespob, “Combined hydro-wind generation bids in a pool-based electricity market,” *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 79, pp. 10381046, 2009.
- [2] E. Baeyens, E. Bitar, P.P. Khargonekar, and K. Poolla. “Coalitional aggregation of wind power.” *Power Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, no. 4 (2013): 3774-3784.
- [3] G. N. Bathurst, J. Weatherill, and G. Strbac, “Trading wind generation in short term energy markets,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 17, pp. 782-789, 2002.
- [4] E. Bitar *et al.*, “Bringing wind energy to market.” *Power Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, no. 3 (2012): 1225-1235.
- [5] E. Bitar, R. Rajagopal, P.P. Khargonekar, K. Poolla, “The role of co-located storage for wind power producers in conventional electricity markets,” *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE American Control Conference*, San Francisco, CA, 2011.
- [6] A. Cavallo, “High capacity factor wind energy systems,” *J Sol Energy Eng* 1995;117(5):13743.
- [7] A. Cavallo, “Controllable and affordable utility-scale electricity from intermittent wind resources and compressed air energy storage (CAES),” *Energy*, 2007;32(2):1207.
- [8] J. DeCesaro and K. Porter, “Wind energy and power system operations: A review of wind integration studies to date,” *The Electricity Journal*, vol. 22, pp. 34-43, 2009.
- [9] E.D. Castronuova and J.A. Pecos Lopes, “Optimal operation and hydro storage sizing of wind-hydro power plant,” *Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 26 (2004), 771778.
- [10] P. Denholm, E. Ela, B. Kirby, and M. Milligan, “The Role of Energy Storage with Renewable Electricity Generation,” *Technical Report NREL/TP-6A2-47187*, January 2010.
- [11] P. Denholm and R. Sioshansi, “The value of compressed air energy storage with wind in transmission- constrained electric power systems,” *Energy Policy*, vol. 37, pp. 31493158, 2009.
- [12] C.J. Dent, J.W. Bialek, and B.F. Hobbs. “Opportunity cost bidding by wind generators in forward markets: Analytical results.” *Power Systems, IEEE Transactions on* 26.3 (2011): 1600-1608.
- [13] K. C. Divya and J. Ostergaard, “Battery energy storage technology for power systems: An overview,” *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 79, pp. 511520, 2009.
- [14] <http://www.oe.energy.gov/storage.html>
- [15] http://www.nrel.gov/wind/systemsintegration/energy_storage.html
- [16] EnerNex Corp., Eastern Wind Integration and Transmission Study, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Report NREL/SR-550-47078, January 2010.
- [17] Integration of Variable Generation Task Force, “Accommodating High Levels of Variable Generation,” North America Reliability Corporation, 2009.

- [18] GE Energy, Western Wind and Solar Integration Study, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Report NREL/SR-550-47434, May 2010.
- [19] Global Wind 2009 Report, Global Wind Energy Council, Brussels, Belgium, 2010.
- [20] J. B. Greenblatt, S. Succar, D. C. Denkenberger, R. H. Williams, and R. H. Socolow, "Baseload wind energy: modeling the competition between gas turbines and compressed air energy storage for supplemental generation," *Energy Policy*, vol. 35, pp. 1474-1492, Mar 2007.
- [21] P. Harsha and M. Dahleh, "Optimal management and sizing of energy storage under dynamic pricing for the efficient integration of renewable energy," *Power Systems*, IEEE Transactions on 30.3 (2015): 1164-1181.
- [22] D. L. Katz and E. R. Lady, *Compressed air storage for electric power generation*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ulrich's Book Inc., 1976.
- [23] J.H. Kim and W.B. Powell, "Optimal energy commitments with storage and intermittent supply," *Operations Research*, 59.6.1347-1360, 2011.
- [24] A. Kusiak and W. Y. Li, "Short-term Prediction of Wind power with a Clustering Approach," *Renewable Energy*, vol. 35, pp. 2362-2369, 2010.
- [25] M. Korpaas, A. T. Holen, and R. Hildrum, "Operation and sizing of energy storage for wind power plants in a market system," *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 599-606, Oct. 2003.
- [26] H. Lund and G. Salgi, "The role of compressed air energy storage (CAES) in future sustainable energy systems," *Energy Conversion and Management* 50 (2009) 11721179.
- [27] J. Matevosyan and L. Sajder, "Minimization of imbalance cost trading wind power on the short-term power market," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 21, pp. 1396-1404, 2006.
- [28] J.M. Morales, A.J. Conejo, and J. Perez-Ruiz, "Short-term trading for a wind power producer," *Power Systems*, IEEE Transactions on 25.1 (2010): 554-564.
- [29] T. Oshima, M. Kajita, and A. Okuno, "Development of Sodium-Sulfur Batteries," *Int. J. Appl. Ceram. Technol.*, vol. 1, pp. 269-76, 2004.
- [30] F. Paganini, P. Belzarena, and P. Monzn. "Decision making in forward power markets with supply and demand uncertainty," *Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*, 2014 48th Annual Conference on. IEEE, 2014.
- [31] N. Petruzzzi, M. Dada, "Pricing and the newsvendor problem: a review with extensions," *Operations Research*. 47.183-94, 1999.
- [32] P. Pinson, C. Chevallier, and G. N. Kariniotakis, "Trading wind generation from short-term probabilistic forecasts of wind power," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 22, pp. 1148-1156, 2007.
- [33] Qin, Junjie, et al. "Online modified greedy algorithm for storage control under uncertainty," in *Power Systems*, IEEE Transactions on (2015): 1-15.
- [34] S. Succar and R. H. Williams, "Compressed air energy storage: Theory, resources, and applications for wind power," *Energy Systems Analysis Group*, Princeton University, 2008.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem IV.3

We establish concavity of $J^{\pi^*}(x; \theta)$ directly. Fix a storage type $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and let $x_{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $x_{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary forward contracts.⁴ Let

$$x_{(\lambda)} = \lambda x_{(1)} + (1 - \lambda) x_{(2)}$$

denote a convex combination of said contracts, where $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We denote by $\pi_{(\cdot)}^* \in \Pi(\theta)$ the optimal control policy associated with the contract $x_{(\cdot)}$. And, given any admissible policy $\pi \in \Pi(\theta)$, we let $\{z_k^\pi\}$ and $\{u_k^\pi\}$ denote the random state and input processes, respectively, induced by said policy π .

We proceed in establishing the desired result by proving directly:

$$J^{\pi_{(\lambda)}^*}(x_{(\lambda)}; \theta) \geq \lambda J^{\pi_{(1)}^*}(x_{(1)}; \theta) + (1 - \lambda) J^{\pi_{(2)}^*}(x_{(2)}; \theta).$$

Consider the forward contract $x_{(\lambda)}$. And consider a policy $\pi_{(\lambda)}$ inducing the input process $u_k^{\pi_{(\lambda)}} = \lambda u_k^{\pi_{(1)}} + (1 - \lambda) u_k^{\pi_{(2)}}$,

where the associated state process is recursively determined by $z_{k+1}^{\pi_{(\lambda)}} = z_k^{\pi_{(\lambda)}} - u_k^{\pi_{(\lambda)}}$ for $z_0^{\pi_{(\lambda)}} = 0$. It is not difficult to see that $z_k^{\pi_{(\lambda)}} = \lambda z_k^{\pi_{(1)}} + (1 - \lambda) z_k^{\pi_{(2)}}$. Admissibility of $\pi_{(\lambda)}$ is therefore immediate, as the underlying constraints on both the state and input define convex sets. It follows that

$$J^{\pi_{(\lambda)}^*}(x_{(\lambda)}; \theta) \geq J^{\pi_{(\lambda)}}(x_{(\lambda)}; \theta),$$

by optimality of policy $\pi_{(\lambda)}^* \in \Pi(\theta)$ for the contract $x_{(\lambda)}$. Expanding the expression to the right of the inequality further, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\pi_{(\lambda)}}(x_{(\lambda)}; \theta) &= N \cdot p x_{(\lambda)} - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g(x_{(\lambda)}, u_k^{\pi_{(\lambda)}}, \xi_k) \right] \\ &\geq N \cdot p x_{(\lambda)} - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \lambda g(x_{(1)}, u_k^{\pi_{(1)}}, \xi_k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - \lambda) g(x_{(2)}, u_k^{\pi_{(2)}}, \xi_k) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$= \lambda J^{\pi_{(1)}^*}(x_{(1)}; \theta) + (1 - \lambda) J^{\pi_{(2)}^*}(x_{(2)}; \theta), \quad (13)$$

where the inequality (12) follows from convexity of g and the decomposition $\xi_k = \lambda \xi_k + (1 - \lambda) \xi_k$. The final equality (13) follows from the optimality of the policies $\pi_{(1)}^* \in \Pi(\theta)$ and $\pi_{(2)}^* \in \Pi(\theta)$ for the contracts $x_{(1)}$ and $x_{(2)}$ respectively. Thus, $J^{\pi^*}(x; \theta)$ is a concave function in x over $\mathbb{R}_+$.

B. Proof of Theorem V.1

Monotonicity is straightforward. Fix a storage type $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Let $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Clearly, $\Pi(\theta + \varepsilon) \supseteq \Pi(\theta)$ and hence $J^*(\theta + \varepsilon) \geq J^*(\theta)$. The proof of concavity of $J^*(\theta)$ in θ over $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ is analogous to the proof of Theorem IV.3.

C. Proof of Theorem V.5

Fix $r > 0$, and write $x^*(b) = x^*(\theta)$ and $\pi^*(b) = \pi^*(\theta)$ to isolate their dependence on the energy capacity parameter b , as we have fixed r .

We begin the proof by expressing the (right) partial derivative of $J^*(\theta)$ with respect to b at the origin as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial J^*(\theta)}{\partial b} \Big|_{b=0} &= pN \frac{\partial x^*(b)}{\partial b} \Big|_{b=0} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q^{\pi^*(\varepsilon)}(x^*(\varepsilon), \xi) - Q^{\pi^*(0)}(x^*(0), \xi)}{\varepsilon} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

It is straightforward to show right differentiability of $x^*(b)$ at $b = 0$. We proceed in establishing existence of the limit through it's explicit characterization. First, define a sequence of functions $\{f_n\}$, mapping sample paths $\xi \in [0, 1]^N$ into $\mathbb{R}$, as

$$f_n(\xi) = \frac{Q^{\pi^*(\varepsilon_n)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n), \xi) - Q^{\pi^*(0)}(x^*(0), \xi)}{\varepsilon_n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}$$

where $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ is a suitably defined sequence of non-negative real numbers converging monotonically to zero. We will prove

⁴The subscripts here are not to be confused with time indices.

Theorem V.5 through application of the Bounded Convergence Theorem. We first have the following result establishing almost sure convergence and uniform boundedness of the sequence $\{f_n(\xi)\}$. See Appendix D for its proof.

Proposition A.1. *Let $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P})$ denote the complete probability space according to which the random variables $\xi = (\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$ are defined, where $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the Borel σ -algebra on $\mathbb{R}$. It follows that:*

(i) $\{f_n(\xi)\}$ constitutes a sequence of real-valued random variables converging almost surely to the real-valued random variable $f(\xi)$ defined by

$$f(\xi) = \frac{\partial x^*(b)}{\partial b} \Big|_{b=0} (\alpha \cdot |\mathcal{K}^-(x^*(0), \xi)| - \beta \cdot |\mathcal{K}^+(x^*(0), \xi)|) - (\alpha + \beta) \cdot \Lambda(x^*(0), \xi) - \beta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(x^*(0), \infty)}(\xi_{N-1}).$$

The random variables $f(\xi)$ and $\{f_n(\xi)\}$ are defined on the common probability space $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P})$.

(ii) There exists a constant $M < \infty$, such that $|f_n(\xi)| < M$ almost surely.

It follows from Prop. A.1 and the Bounded Convergence Theorem that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f_n(\xi)] = \mathbb{E}[f(\xi)]$. Note that it suffices for uniform boundedness to hold almost surely, as the underlying probability space is complete by assumption. Finally, it follows from Lemma V.4 that

$$\mathbb{E} [\alpha \cdot |\mathcal{K}^-(x^*(0), \xi)| - \beta \cdot |\mathcal{K}^+(x^*(0), \xi)|] = pN.$$

The desired result follows immediately.

D. Proof of Proposition A.1

Throughout the proof, we restrict our attention to only those sample paths ξ exhibiting strict crossings of the contract $x^*(0)$. Accordingly, define the set $\mathcal{S} = \{\xi \in [0, 1]^N \mid \xi_k \neq x^*(0) \ \forall k\}$ as the set of sample paths ξ that are nowhere equal to $x^*(0)$. It follows from Assumption 2 that $\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in \mathcal{S}\} = 1$.

Proof of Part (i). We first show that the sequence of functions $\{f_n\}$ converges pointwise to f on $\mathcal{S}$. Fix $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$. We begin by controlling the behavior of the sequence $\{f_n(\xi)\}$ for n large enough. Denote by

$$\mathcal{I}_n^-(\xi) = \{0 \leq k \leq N-2 \mid \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_k(\xi)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n)) = 1\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{I}_n^+(\xi) = \{0 \leq k \leq N-2 \mid \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{U}_k(\xi)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n)) = 1\}$$

the finite collection of time indices at which the sample path ξ exhibits strict downcrossings and upcrossings of the level $x^*(\varepsilon_n)$, respectively.

By right continuity of the optimal contract $x^*(b)$ at $b = 0$, there exists an $N_1(\xi) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{I}_m^\pm(\xi) = \mathcal{I}_\ell^\pm(\xi)$ for all $m, \ell \geq N_1(\xi)$. Define also

$$N_2(\xi) = \min\{n \geq N_1(\xi) \mid \varepsilon_n \leq \min\{r, |\xi_k - x^*(\varepsilon_n)|\} \ \forall k\}.$$

Intuitively, one can ensure that, for $n \geq N_2(\xi)$, any $x^*(\varepsilon_n)$ -level downcrossing (upcrossing) event will result in a full discharge (charge) of the stored energy in the amount of ε_n

under the optimal control policy $\pi^*(\varepsilon_n)$. We now develop a closed form expression for the optimal imbalance cost $Q^{\pi^*(\varepsilon_n)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n), \xi)$ for $n \geq N_2(\xi)$.

Let $n \geq N_2(\xi)$. It is not difficult to see that, under the optimal control policy $\pi^*(\varepsilon_n)$ (cf. Prop. IV.2), the storage system is fully charged (discharged) only at times immediately following a strict ξ upcrossing (downcrossing) of $x^*(\varepsilon_n)$. More precisely, the sequence of optimal control inputs can be explicitly expressed as

$$u_k^{\pi^*(\varepsilon_n)} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_n \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, \xi_k)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n)), & k = 0 \\ \varepsilon_n \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{U}_{k-1}(\xi)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n)) - \varepsilon_n \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{k-1}(\xi)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n)), & k > 0 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, N-1$. Substituting Equation (15) into our nominal expression for imbalance cost

$$Q^{\pi^*(\varepsilon_n)}(x^*(\varepsilon_n), \xi) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g(x^*(\varepsilon_n), u_k^{\pi^*(\varepsilon_n)}, \xi_k),$$

we have

$$f_n(\xi) = -(\alpha + \beta)\Lambda(x^*(\varepsilon_n), \xi) - \beta \mathbf{1}_{(x^*(\varepsilon_n), \infty)}(\xi_{N-1}) + \left(\alpha |\mathcal{K}^-(\xi, x^*(\varepsilon_n))| - \beta |\mathcal{K}^+(\xi, x^*(\varepsilon_n))| \right) \left(\frac{x^*(\varepsilon_n) - x^*(0)}{\varepsilon_n} \right)$$

The pointwise convergence $\{f_n\}$ to f on $\mathcal{S}$ follows from the fact that

$$\mathcal{K}^\pm(\xi, x^*(\varepsilon_n)) = \mathcal{K}^\pm(\xi, x^*(0)),$$

for $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ and $n \geq N_2(\xi)$.

We now show that the convergence is *almost sure*. First notice that each function $f_n : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ – being a finite linear combination of indicator functions defined on Borel measurable sets – is Borel measurable. Since the composition of measurable functions is measurable, it follows that the composition $f_n(\xi)$ is a random variable on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P})$. The same is true for the pointwise limit function $f(\xi)$. Almost sure convergence is immediate as

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(\xi) = f(\xi) \right\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\xi \in \mathcal{S}\} = 1.$$

This completes the proof of Part (i).

Proof of Part (ii). We first show uniform boundedness of each function $f_n : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on $\mathcal{S}$. By assumption, we have restricted the image of each random variable ξ_k to $[0, 1]$ for all k . As an immediate consequence, we have that $0 \leq x^*(b) \leq 1$ for all $b \geq 0$. It follows from this fact and right differentiability of $x^*(b)$ at $b = 0$ that

$$B := \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{x^*(\varepsilon_n) - x^*(0)}{\varepsilon_n} \right| \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} < \infty.$$

Combining this upper bound with the observation that $|\mathcal{K}^-(\xi, x^*(\varepsilon_n))|, |\mathcal{K}^+(\xi, x^*(\varepsilon_n))|, \Lambda(\xi, x^*(\varepsilon_n)) \leq N$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$, we have that

$$|f_n(\xi)| \leq NB \cdot (\alpha + \beta) + N \cdot (\alpha + \beta) + \beta$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$. Uniform boundedness holds almost surely as $\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in \mathcal{S}\} = 1$. This completes the proof of Part (ii).